DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 291 CE 053 176

AUTHOR Roper, John J.
TITLE Report on the Massachusetts Field Test of the Applied Communication Curriculum.
SPONS AGENCY Massachusetts Univ., Boston.
PUB DATE 31 Aug 89
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Field Tests; *Instructional Material Evaluation; Instructional Systems; Learning Modules; Secondary Education; Sex Differences; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Applied Communication

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to field test the Applied Communications curriculum, a curriculum intended for both vocational and comprehensive school students in the mid-50 percent of the school by class standing. The field test sought to determine if teachers found the materials effective in teaching communications skills to such a population, how students reacted to this instruction, and if there were a most effective grade level or instructional strategy for such a course. Students at four schools were taught a course for 1 year using the Applied Communications instructional system. Both teachers and students were surveyed during the year. The teachers found the materials to be effective in teaching communication skills to their students. They suggested that future teachers need to augment the materials significantly in some areas in order to call the program "English," but that access to such materials was a big advantage. Their group reaction was that the best instructional setting might be in grade 9 or 10 for many of the units and that, in some cases, a good place to begin teaching might be the module entitled "Working in Groups." Sixty percent of the students answered that they felt that instruction in communications belongs as a part of their English course and 55.3 percent said that they would recommend such a course to their friends. Boys liked the course more than the girls. (Three appendices are attached: a list of the names of field test schools, the evaluation instruments, and a copy of the student responses. A three-item bibliography is also included.) (NLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310291

Report on the Massachusetts Field Test of the Applied Communication Curriculum

prepared by

John J. Roper

College of Education
Saginaw Valley State Univ.
2250 Pierce Road
University Center, MI 48710

prepared for the College of Education, University of Mass., Boston, August 31, 1989.

CE 053176

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Roper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the findings of the initial Massachusetts field test of the Applied Communications curriculum.

Applied Communications was developed by a consortium of state and provincial departments of vocational education under the leadership of the Agency for Instructional Technology of Bloomington, Indiana, intended for both vocational students and comprehensive school students in the mid-50% of the school by class-standing. This field test sought to determine if teachers found the materials effective in teaching communication skills to such a population, how students reacted to this instruction, and if there were a most effective grade level or instructional strategy for such a course.

Students at four schools were taught a course for one year using the Applied Communications instructional system. Teachers of these students were surveyed verbally three times during the year, individually and in groups, and provided written evaluations at the end of each instructional module. Students were surveyed in writing once during the school year.

The teachers found the materials to be effective in teaching communication skills to their students. They suggested that future teachers need to augment the materials significantly in some areas in order to call the program "English," but that access to such materials was a significant advantage. Their group reaction was that the best instructional setting might be in grades 9 or 10 for many of the units and that, in some cases, a good place to begin teaching might be the module entitled "Working in Groups."

Sixty percent of the students answered that they felt that instruction in communications belonged as a part of their English course and 55.3% said that they would recommend such a course to their friends. Boys, apparently, liked the course more than girls, reporting significantly higher on two questions designed to indicate approval.

Report on the Massachusetts Field Test

of the

Applied Communication

Curriculum

for use in secondary
and
vocational-technical schools in Massachusetts

During 1987, a prospectus was issued by the Agency for Instructional Technology in Bloomington, Indiana, to the state Directors of Vocational Education, seeking funding for a consortium of states to cooperate in the development of a new secondary school curriculum to be called Applied Communication.

Part of the development cost for this project was to include a national field test. In addition, individual states were encouraged to conduct their own field tests during the 1988-89 school year. The following report details the experiences of the field test conducted in Massachusetts by offices of the College of Education of the University of Massachusetts, Boston. All findings of this report are attributable solely to data provided by the Massachusetts test schools and should be cautiously extrapolated to other environments. Results of the National Field Test may be obtained from the Agency for Instructional Technology, PO Box A, Bloomington, IN 86095.

INTRODUCTION

In response to a "Request for Proposals" issued by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation of the Division of Occupational Education of the Massachusetts Department of Education, four schools indicated a desire to field test the Applied Communications materials. The Request was sent both to vocational schools and to comprehensive schools with a significant number of vocational programs. As a part of the Request, each school was asked to identify the population which would be exposed to the materials (the "test group, "consisting largely of mid-range students in any grade level), the participating instructor, and to provide certain facilities for the use of the test classes. In all cases, videotape players and monitors were provided by the participating schools. A listing of the pilot test schools and teachers is provided in Appendix A.

The field test was conducted by the Applied Academics Project of the College of Education of the University of Massachusetts, Boston. Dr. James Case, Associate Dean of the College, served as Principal Investigator for the project. Liaison to the Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation was provided by John McDonagh of the Division of Occupational Education.

In all cases, the instructors chosen by the participating schools were talented and experienced professional educators. All had been working for several years as English Teachers and all were conducting English

literature and composition classes concurrently with their classes in Applied Communications.

This field test was intended to answer two primary questions: are the materials effective in a classroom environment and is there an optimal instructional methodology to maximize their effectiveness. Other questions were posed (and presumably at least partially answered) in Applied Communication: A Pilot Test of the Prototype Module (Agency for Instructional Technology, November 1987, also called Research Report Number 101).

This report will not present an exhaustive review of literature on the development of the course materials or on the formative testing process. Its function is merely to report the results of the Massachusetts field test and provide data for other states upon which to build. Because of the nature of the development process for the materials, however, it will be necessary to cite some findings reported to the consortium of states by the developers.

In April, 1985, the Agency for Instructional Technology of Bloomington, Indiana, began discussions with state directors of vocational education which "clearly indicated that additional curriculum and materials in applied mathematics and communication were high priorities." (Agency for Instructional Technology, Final Design Report, March, 1987). Copies of this report are available from the Agency for Instructional Technology.

In August of 1986, a list of competencies developed by the AIT staff was presented to a group of educators and representatives from private industry for validation. That list would be formulated into a design document, which was finalized and published in March, 1987.

This document provided the framework for the development of the prototype module "Following and Giving Directions." The prototype module was pilot tested in September of 1987, and this test provided information needed to review the prototype materials. Based upon the model represented by the revised prototype, the remaining fourteen modules were developed subsequently and field tested in the various states comprising the national consortium during the 1988-89 school year.

Some revisions of the materials were made, particularly in the video segments. Data was more or less formally collected by state consortium representatives and returned to AIT at a national meeting in Memphis, Tennessee. The methods of collection of these data were not standardized by AIT.

The initial hypotheses of this study was that the Applied Communications instructional materials will be useful in teaching the principles of effective workplace communication to students studying in a vocational school environment.

THE SUBJECTS

Students in each of the schools were chosen in different ways. In one school, the students were a group chosen from an "at-risk" population. These young people ranged in age from seventeen through nineteen, and had been identified as "learning disabled," participants in English as a Second Language programs, and even "mentally retarded." That school chose not to provide written data for this report.

At one of the responding schools, the students had enrolled in a senior English course, level A but were not told of their participation in a field test of new instructional materials. In another case, the students were recruited to an "experimental" course, with no mention being made of the purpose or mechanics of the Applied Communications curriculum. The final school sought "volunteers" to participate in an "experimental English course" which was guaranteed English academic credit. In short, the sample chosen to test the materials represented as wide-ranging a group as could be obtained.

Subjects were both male and female in grades eleven and twelve, ranging in age from seventeen through ninteen years. A total of five classes used the materials, although only thirty-nine student surveys were analyzed to provide data for the report.

PROCEDURE

During August of 1988, all of the field test teachers met at a centralized site for a training session. Patricia O'Connell, one of the teachers who had been intimately involved with the early development of the materials, conducted a workshop in which the other field test teachers were introduced both to the materials and to the "most effective" methods of their use. She clearly explained to all participants that the purpose of the field test was to determine the most appropriate audience for the materials as well as the best instructional strategies, and

that they were ultimately free to experiment as they chose within their own classroom situations.

In the Massachusetts field test, two instruments were used to evaluate the materials. Both instruments are included in Appendix B. One was designed to determine student characteristics and a very general reaction to the level of comfort experienced in their exposure to the course. The second instrument was designed to provide a formal means for the teachers to react to the materials and evaluate their students' response to them.

Teachers at each of the schools were asked to complete the Teacher Evaluation when they finished teaching each module. Students were asked to complete the Student Profile data only once, roughly three-quarters of the way through the school year.

While four teachers participated in the field test, teachers at only two schools, involving thirty-nine students provided hard data for the completion of this report. All four teachers were, however, interviewed on at least three occasions, and their tape recorded comments were used to formulate conclusions about the materials. The teachers were convened in November and March in group sessions and were visited on-site in January. Group sessions were utilized not only to gather anecdotal data, but to reinforce instructional strategies and provide support for the instructors who might be experiencing classroom difficulties. There was relatively little difficulty reported, but all four teachers agreed that collegial reinforcement was important to them.

Completed instruments were returned to the College of Education at the conclusion of the school year for analysis.

RESULTS

Twenty-seven male and twelve female students at two schools participated in the study by returning completed Profile sheets. In the interest of privacy, each of the two responding schools will be designated by a letter. All 12 of the students from School A were in the eleventh grade, while all twenty seven students from School B were grade twelve. The test group in School A was 41.6% female and the School B class was 25.9% female.

The students at these two schools reported their ages

as ranging from 16 through eighteen years, and described themselves as predominantly middle of the population students as shown below:

	Academic Averages in English			
School	A	B	C	D
School A	2	5	5	0
School B	1	14	11	1

Each school thus met the criterion for selection of the test population as specified in the Request for Proposals issued by the Division of Occupational Education.

POPULATION BY SEX

		male	female	total
School A	number	7	5	12
	percent	58.3%	41.7%	100%
School B	number	20	7	27
	percent	74.1%	25.9%	100%
Cumulative	number	27	12	39
	percent	69.2%	30.8%	100%

Each student was asked if he or she felt that the Applied Communications materials belonged as a part of an English course. In both schools, the students replied affirmatively, although in neither case were the responses unequivocal. In School A, 66.7% of the students responded positively while in School B, only 57.1% felt that the materials were appropriate for an English class.

When asked if they would "recommend a course like this to your friends," the students at School A duplicated their

replies to the earlier question and 66.7% of them replied that they would. As a point of information, the internal validity on these two items at School A was complete. Students at School B were absolutely unenthusiastic about the course, responding exactly 50% in the affirmative, with one student not responding. It should be pointed however, that all of the students at School B responded that they had not had the opportunity to elect Applied Communications as a course and were assigned to the course, called "English A," as a grade twelve requirement.

STUDENT RESPONSES BY NUMBER

	School A		School B	
	yes	no	yes	no
Belongs as part of English course	8	4	16	12
Would recommend to friends	8	4	13	13

STUDENT RESPONSES BY PERCENT

	School A		School B	
	yes	no	yes	no
Belongs as part of English course	66.7	33.3	57.1	42.9
Would recommend to friends	66.7	33.3	50.0	50.0

STUDENT RESPONSES CUMULATIVE

	yes	no
Belongs as part of English course	60.0%	40.0%
Would recommend to friends	55.3%	44.7%

STUDENT RESPONSES BY SEX
affirmative reaponses by percent

	School A		School B	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Belongs as part of English course	87.5	50.0	68.4	42.8
Would recommend to friends	85.7	50.0	50.0	42.8

The students in School B has a varied background in their three previous years at the school. When asked to indicate prior English courses, 51.7% listed Literature, 40.7% listed Grammar, 37.0% took "general" or "regular English" courses, 14.8% reported that they took "basic English, and 7.4% either reported that they had taken no English at all or "couldn't recall" what course, if any, had been completed. The percentages exceed 100% due to multiple responses, and the character of these responses indicated that the students had little knowledge of, or more likely, interest in, the syllabi of courses they had completed. Students at School A chose not to respond to this question.

Specific student responses to the question "Would you recommend a course like this to your friends? Please explain why or why not:" are given in Appendix C. It is interesting to note that not one of the 12 students at School A answered any questions requiring a written response (as opposed to a check mark in a labeled box). As a result, all of the comments included in Appendix C came from School B which had, as previously stated, an equal number of positive and negative replies.

The results of the teacher questionaire will be reported somewhat differently. No directions were given to the teachers regarding the modules to test with the students or the sequence in which to teach them. It was concluded that there might turn out to be a sequence of teaching the modules which might be better than any recommended sequence, and indeed, certain suggestions were made by the test teachers.

Despite the fact that teachers were not told which modules to test, both reporting teachers happened to have tried several of the same modules. They will be reported without comment, completely as received from the reporting schools. The teachers at both Schools A and B completed modules 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7. This section will discuss general responses by the teachers. Complete results will be provided in Appendix D.

Module being evaluated: The teachers evaluated the first seven modules of the program in this test.

1. What did you like most about the module?

In general, the teachers liked the group work provided in the program and the applications to real world situations, although they did point out specific exercises and materials that were less effective than others.

2. What did you like least about the module?

All of the teachers expressed some discomfort with the irregularity of the presentations. The consensus was that the range of difficulty went from "babyish" to very difficult. It was felt that the first four modules were too elementary, the fifth was average, and the sixth and seventh good.

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent Good Accept. Poor Very Poor
Video	Videos were said to improve in the later unit
Stu. Text	There were specific criticisms of the text.
Lessons 1-7	Criticisms here again were specific.
Occ.-Spec. Areas	Apparently some students had difficulty generalizing from the specifics. In addition, many applications were very much alike. See discussion section.
Teach. Guide	Generally received favorably by all, although specific suggestions were provided.

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor."

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?

In general, the teachers felt more comfortable with the material in the later units. Most of the early units were rated as too simplistic for eleventh and twelfth grade students, although they held significant promise for grades nine and/or ten.

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?

Most of the teachers experienced some degree of discomfort, although the extent that this would be overcome simply by another year of teaching with the materials is problematic.

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

In general, the teachers did not feel that there was a high degree of resistance to the material which was reflected in an unusual aversion to homework. There was, as always, some discussion on the state of the home in modern America, but it did not seem germane to Applied Communication.

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

Since this course represented a departure from the accustomed way of teaching high school English, the teachers seemed unclear as to what exactly they wanted the Teacher's Guide to provide, but there seemed to be general satisfaction with the Guide as constituted.

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?

Reactions to this question were content specific, depending on the unit being covered, the class, and the teacher. The one thing that appeared constant with each unit, however, was a problem with the packaging. Storage of the videotape in the same box with the Teacher's Guide and a copy of the student text created a package too bulky to fit in a briefcase and somewhat unwieldy to store in the faculty office.

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

Teachers indicated somewhere between thirty and ninety minutes of preparation time for each module, depending on the content. There were no particular complaints that this amount of time represented a serious problem.

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module.

There was very little agreement among the teachers on this topic. It was felt that the class, the material, and the teacher's background and goal for the class all played a role here.

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

There was some disagreement here as well. One may speculate that the teacher's reaction to the reading level of the materials and its appropriateness for his or her class relates more directly to the class than to the materials.

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

Reactions to this question were specific.

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

The reaction of the teachers was that the material was important and worthwhile for high school students, particularly from a vocational school environment, to learn. They were less certain that the materials were appropriate for "an English class," although an operational definition of the latter term would have clarified such an observation considerably.

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

All of the teachers agreed that the Applied Communications text, video and Teachers' Guide represented a valuable set of resources for English teachers in Massachusetts. These will be discussed in the final section of this report.

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

Reactions were specific for each module.

DISCUSSION

It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of a curriculum based upon the sample size with which this test proceeded, with the lack of a defined population, and with the other constraints present in this study. That task will be left to others.

The original purpose of this study was to test the materials of the Applied Communication curriculum in the classrooms of Massachusetts to determine their usefulness in the vocational school environment. This study hypothesized that the materials would prove to be valuable in use.

Information provided by the teachers indicated that, taken as a whole, the materials did indeed represent a valuable resource for English teachers.

There were several allusions to the failure of the New England student to relate to occupationally specific activities involving agriculture and agribusiness. In addition, some of the teachers noted that activities specifically targeted to "agribusiness" and "business" were effectively the same. One might speculate that such an occurrance might well be the by-product of a national consortium representing disparate interests in all parts of the country. The teachers did not identify this area of concern as a major drawback as much as a minor irritation.

Few of the teachers were as willing to admit that Applied Communication would qualify in their schools as a traditional English course. The consensus was that the teacher would need to provide outside resources and augment the reading part of the course to qualify as "English."

There was at least one teacher who expressed the opinion that the traditional high school English course was less valuable for her students than Applied Communication, but agreed that she would use the materials in a different way next year.

In all fairness, the designers never intended the course to be an "English" course. It was called Applied Communication because it was, in fact, a communication skills course. The teachers agreed that the materials would be appropriate for a full course in "communications" if one were offered as an elective at a particular school. They all agreed that they would be using parts of the material integrated into other areas of their curriculum next year, although two teachers suggested that they would try the materials as a complete English course at a lower grade level.

This test sought to determine if there might be an optimum order in which to teach the modules. The developers intended for the materials to be "infusible;" that is, able to be taught in the context of another program of study, such as home economics, business or shop. One of the teachers had indicated an early resistance of her students to work in groups. It was suggested that the module on "Working in Groups" might be an appropriate place to start if the teacher anticipated such a circumstance. Other than that one module for that specific situation, none of the teachers indicated any preference for one unit as a foundation over any other unit.

It has been well documented that employers need workers who can read, write, listen and speak to one another in the workplace. Executive seminars are regularly conducted on subjects such as "How To Listen Effectively," "Power Communicating," "Making Effective Presentations" and "Public Speaking." It seems that an effective set of classroom tools for the secondary school teacher to use in helping students communicate effectively would be a decided asset. The results of this field test indicate that, with judicious selection and augmentation at the appropriate grade level, Applied Communication represents such a tool kit.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Field Test Schools

Pathfinder Regional Vocational School
Route 181
Palmer, MA 01069
(413) 283-9701

Patricia O'Connell, Instructor.

Silver Lake Regional School
Pembroke Street
Kingston, MA 02364
(617) 585-3844

Joanne Fallon, Instructor

Tri-County Regional School
147 Pond Street
Franklin, MA 02038
(508) 528-5400

Judith Gagnon, Instructor

Upper Cape Regional Vocational School
220 Sandwhich Road
Bourne, MA 02532
(508) 759-7711

William Lord, Instructor

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

APPLIED COMMUNICATIONS

STUDENT PROFILE
(One time only)

1. Are you ____ female ____ male

2. What is your grade level?
____ 9 ____ 10 ____ 11 ____ 12
____ other (give number)

3. How old are you?
____ 13 ____ 14 ____ 15 ____ 16 ____ other (give number)

4. What previous English courses have you taken?

_____

_____

5. What made you decide to take Applied Communication?

_____

_____

4. If you had to give yourself a reportcard grade on your previous English courses, what grade would you give yourself?

____ A ____ B ____ C ____ D

5. Do you believe that teaching about communications belongs as a part of your English course?

____ Yes ____ No ____ Maybe

6. Would you recommend a course like Applied Communication to your friends? Please explain why or why not.

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for participating in this test. Your participation will help to make Applied Communication a better course for anyone who takes it after you.

Teacher Evaluation
Applied Communication

Module being evaluated: _____

1. What did you like most about the module?

_____

_____

2. What did you like least about the module?

_____

_____

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent	Good	Accept.	Poor	Very Poor
Video					
Stu. Text					
Lessons 1-7					
Occ.-Spec. Areas					
Teach. Guide					

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor."

_____

_____

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?
___ Yes ___ NO ___ Probably

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?
___ Yes ___ NO ___ Probably

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

____ Yes ____ NO ____ Probably

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

____ Yes ____ NO ____ Probably

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?

_____

_____

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

_____

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module. _____

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

____ Too difficult
____ Too easy
____ About right

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

____ Yes ____ NO ____ Probably

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

____ Yes ____ NO ____ Probably

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

_____

_____

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

STUDENT RESPONSES

When asked to respond to the question "Would you recommend a course like this to your friends?" 55.26% of the students surveyed said that they would. They were then asked to "explain why or why not." While a number of students chose not to answer at all, those who did answered in the following ways:

(NOTE: thees comments are transcribed directly from the student responses. Spelling, capitalization and punctuation (or lack thereof) are unedited.)

YES

because I think good communication is lacking today between family members and others in the community. I think they could benefit from this course as I did.

it was interesting

Because it's teaching practical knowledge that people need to know

very helpfull, easily applied to real life circumstances

It was entertaining

but for freshmen.

Because they can learn to communicate better

It fun and educational

good for seniors. It teaches you about things you migt use someday

But it should have more pratical bacing and examples

Because it was a good experience that everyone should profit from

I would because it keep your interest longer compared to a regular English class

NO

doesn't pertain to what people need to know

puts you asleep and has to be the driest, most boring subject ever

the levels should be more interesting they take too long

too boring on a Z level I'd say I was out like a light

Only a few of the lessons seem practical. Most of them are boring and unrealistic.

I didn't understand everything I don't think that they layed out everything clearly

What they tought, I already knew, It's a normal thing to do.

Not in the 12th grade level "A" Because it was just repeated stuff that we all ready knew.

It was somewhat simplistic -- something more fast-moving and challenging might be more beneficial, as well as not boring or slow

It really didn't teach any thing to me, except things I thought were only common sense.

Some of the videos were vauge + tottally despicable acting. They should be more relaxed.

To boring hard to follow whats going on its a good idea to explain those things but they must present it better; more interesting

Doesn't have any real importance to a tradesman.

APPENDIX D

TEACHER EVALUATIONS BY UNIT

RESULTS OF THE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRES

Module being evaluated: One: Communicating in the Workplace

1. What did you like most about the module?

"Some of the "application" sections were very useful."
"-Teaching the students how to write a memo: - summarizing an article."

2. What did you like least about the module?

"Instructions were too repetitious."
"Basic communication concepts are not dealt with in depth. The short section was not enough for students to grasp the important concepts."

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent	Good	Accept.	Poor	Very Poor
Video			X	X	
Stu. Text			X	X	
Lessons 1-7			XX		
Occ.-Spec. Areas			X	X	
Teach. Guide		XX			

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor."

"The video wasn't very dynamic; therefore it didn't hold the students' attention. The lessons in the specific areas were quite similar to previous lessons."

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?

yes (XX) no probably

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?

Yes, very comfortable (X) No, not very
(X) Yes comfortable Very uncomfortable

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

Definitely (X) Probably not
(X) Probably Definitely not

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

(X) Definitely (X) Probably not
Probably Definitely not

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?

"Students felt that they were given the same message repeatedly."

"More background on basic concepts had to be provided by the teacher."

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

0-30 minutes	(XX) 61-90 minutes
31-60 minutes	more than 90 min.

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module. "3" "8"

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

(X) The text "talks down" to the students.
(X) It's about right
It's too high for them.

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

(X) yes no (X) probably

If 'no,' please explain:
"Students had trouble relating to Mid-West situations."

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

(XX) yes no probably

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

(XX) yes no probably

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

"I taught this unit to Juniors. With modification, it would be better suited to freshmen and sophomores."

Module being evaluated: 2: Gathering and Using Information

1. What did you like most about the module?

"Strategies for requesting written information."
"Chart and graph information."

2. What did you like least about the module?

"Charts."
"The first video."

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent	Good	Accept.	Poor	Very Poor
Video		X(2nd)		X	X(1st)
Stu. Text		X	X		
Lessons 1-7		X	X		
Occ.-Spec. Areas			XX		
Teach. Guide		XX			

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor."

"The first video was unrealistic in the opinion of the cosmetology students and hard in general to relate to. If a cosmetologist spent that much time with each patron, she would be out of business!"

"Video tried to cover too many aspects that were not realistic."

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?

(X) yes (X) no probably

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?

Yes, very comfortable (X) No, not very
(X) Yes comfortable Very uncomfortable

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

Definitely (X) Probably not
(X) Probably Definitely not

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

(X) Definitely Probably not
(X) Probably Definitely not

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?
"Video 1"

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

0-30 minutes (X) 61-90 minutes
(X) 31-60 minutes more than 90 min.

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module. "4" "7"

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

The text "talks down" to the students.
(XX) It's about right
It's too high for them.

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

(XX) yes (x) no probably first yes, second no.

If 'no,' please explain:

"Students felt it was not a real life situation."
"Video 1 is a poor intro -- students are too aware of male cosmetologist with basketball, crippled owner, token black, etc."

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

(XX) yes no probably

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

(X) yes (X) no probably

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

"More realism -- more substance."
"I teach in a vocational school. It would be more impressive if students saw situations they could relate to, i.e. classroom/shop related situations."

Module being evaluated: 3: Using Problem-Solving Strategies

1. What did you like most about the module?

"Grant's Pass Simulation."
"Problem Solving Handbook."

2. What did you like least about the module?

"The video."
"Organization of the student work text."

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent	Good	Accept.	Poor	Very Poor
Video		X(2nd)			XX(1st)
Stu. Text			XX		
Lessons 1-7		X	X		
Occ.-Spec. Area			XX		
Teach. Guide		X	X		

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor."

"The first video again was an unreal setting for the students. They couldn't relate. The problem was too simple for the "solving process." Students solved the problem before the process was explained. Too repetitive."

"Trial and error approach was unrealistic."

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?

(X) yes (X) no probably

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?

Yes, very comfortable (XX) No, not very
Yes comfortable - Very uncomfortable

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

Definitely (X) Probably not
Probably (X) Definitely not*

* Had to cover it in class. Simulation was too complex.

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

(X) Definitely Probably not
Probably (X) Definitely not

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?

"Students could not relate to problems."

"The simulation was hard to sort out. The inserted blue section which contained the handbook should not be "stuck" in the middle of the book. It was confusing to everyone."

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

	0-30 minutes	(X)	61-90 minutes
(X)	31-60 minutes		more than 90 min.

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module. "2" "14 w/ simulation & bkgrnd."

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

(XX) The text "talks down" to the students. (in parts)
It's about right
(X) It's too high for them. (in parts)

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

(X)	yes	(XX)	no	" 2nd yes, probably 1st, no."

If 'no,' please explain:

"The first video turned the students off on the unit. It was difficult to regain their enthusiasm."

"The agricultural section was not relevant."

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

(X)	yes	(X)	no	probably

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

(XX) yes no probably

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

"Present the simulations in a more straightforward, clear manner."

Module being evaluated: 4: Starting a New Job

1. What did you like most about the module?

"Lesson 6 - Managing job stress."
"Video 2."

2. What did you like least about the module?

"Parts of the video. Some of the performers were not good role models."
"Applications were too simplistic."

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent	Good	Accept.	Poor	Very Poor
Video		XX(2nd)	X(1st)		
Stu. Text		XX			
Lessons 1-7		XX			
Occ.-Spec. Areas		X	X		
Teach. Guide		XX			

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor."

(no comments)

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?

(X) yes (X) no probably

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?

Yes, very comfortable No, not very
(XX) Yes comfortable Very uncomfortable

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

Definitely Probably not
(X) Probably (X) Definitely not

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

(X) Definitely Probably not
(X) Probably Definitely not

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?

"The students had already experienced the things presented. Should not be used with Seniors."

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

(X) 0-30 minutes 61-90 minutes
(X) 31-60 minutes more than 90 min.

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module. "3" "2 - the rest of the unit is not useful."

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

(X) The text "talks down" to the students.
(X) It's about right
It's too high for them.

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

(XX) 2nd yes (X) 1st no probably

If 'no,' please explain:
"The manager's appearance caused quite a stir. They were unable to listen to what she said."

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

(X) yes (X) no probably

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

(X) yes (X) no probably

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

"Not very useful with students who have been working for three years."

Module being evaluated: 7: Following & Giving Directions

1. What did you like most about the module?

"Lesson 3 -- written applications were good and very practical."
"Most of the module was excellent."

2. What did you like least about the module?

"Video A."
"Video -- Part 2 -- too repetitive."

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent	Good	Accept.	Poor	Very Poor
Video	X		B	A	
Stu. Text	X	X			
Lessons 1-7	X	X			
Occ.-Spec. Areas	X	X			
Teach. Guide	X	X			

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor."

"The first video was unrealistic. The students were aware that the man was long dead before the process was completed. The format also seems to "talk down" to the students."

(Ed. note -- There are two versions of this video provided to each state by the project. All of the schools in this field test were provided with the same video. It is possible that the teacher may have reacted differently to the other version.)

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?

(XX) yes no probably

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?

(X) Yes, very comfortable No, not very
(X) Yes comfortable Very uncomfortable

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

(X) Definitely Probably not
(X) Probably Definitely not

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

(X)	Definitely		Probably not
(X)	Probably		Definitely not

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?

"Video A."

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

	0-30 minutes		61-90 minutes
(XX)	31-60 minutes		more than 90 min.

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module. "4" "8"

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

	The text "talks down" to the students.
(XX)	It's about right
	It's too high for them.

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

(XX) B yes (X) A no probably

If 'no,' please explain:

"Once again, the second video was more effective than the first. The first was unrealistic in many aspects."

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

(XX) yes no probably

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

(X) yes no (X) probably

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

"Page 33 -- Student text -- misprint. 'Authorotvf'"

In addition to the above modules tested by both teachers (although not necessarily concurrently), the teacher at School A was able to complete two additional modules. This was likely due to the fact that School B tested the materials with Seniors who generally qualify for "Early Release" privileges. The results of that one school's experience is presented as follows:

Module being evaluated: 5: Communicating with Co-workers

1. What did you like most about the module?
"Lesson 4 - Giving and Receiving Information. Lesson 8 -- Organizational Structure."

2. What did you like least about the module?
"Video: too dramatic."

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent	Good	Accept.	Poor	Very Poor
Video			X		
Stu. Text		X			
Lessons 1-7		X			
Occ.-Spec. Areas		X			
Teach. Guide		X			

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor."

(no comments)

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?

(X) yes no probably

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?

Yes, very comfortable
(X) Yes comfortable
No, not very
Very uncomfortable

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

Definitely
(X) Probably
Probably not
Definitely not

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

(X) Definitely
Probably
Probably not
Definitely not

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?

(no comments)

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

0-30 minutes
31-60 minutes
-(X) 61-90 minutes
more than 90 min.

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module. "4"

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

The text "talks down" to the students.
(X) It's about right
It's too high for them.

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

yes no (X) probably

If 'no,' please explain: "Somewhat."

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

(X) yes no probably

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

(X) yes no probably

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

(no comments)

Module being evaluated: 6: Participating in Groups

1. What did you like most about the module?

"Making students aware of the different roles they play in life."

2. What did you like least about the module?

"Role-playing was difficult at times."

3. In terms of overall impact (instructional effectiveness, student interest, manageability), rank each of the components for this unit:

	Excellent	Good	Accept.	Poor	Very Poor
Video		X			
Stu. Text		X			
Lessons 1-7		X			
Occ.-Spec. Areas			X		
Teach. Guide		X			

Please comment on any component that you marked as "poor" or "very poor." (no comments)

4. Was the level of instruction appropriate for your class?

(X) yes no probably

5. Overall, did you feel comfortable teaching the material?

	Yes, very comfortable	No, not very
(X)	Yes comfortable	Very uncomfortable

6. Do you think that your students did the assigned reading/homework?

	Definitely	Probably not
(X)	Probably	Definitely not

7. Did the Teacher's Guide provide you with enough information to help you teach the module?

(X)	Definitely	Probably not
	Probably	Definitely not

8. What caused you the most problems in teaching the module?

"Group work observation form, page 50."

9. On average, how much time did you spend preparing to teach this module?

	0-30 minutes		61-90 minutes
(X)	31-60 minutes		more than 90 min.

10. Based upon your experience with this unit, please estimate the number of 50-minute class periods needed to complete the module. "4"

11. Which of the following best describes the reading level of the materials?

	The text "talks down" to the students.
(X)	It's about right
	It's too high for them.

12. Did the video fulfill the role intended for it?

(X)	yes	no	probably

If 'no,' please explain: (no comments)

13. Do you feel that the material in this module is important for your students to understand?

(X)	yes	no	probably

14. Based upon your experience with this module, would you recommend this module of Applied Communications to other teachers?

(X)	yes	no	probably

15. What other comments or suggestions do you have for this module?

(no comments)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

..., Prospectus for the Development of a Course in Applied Communication (1987). Agency for Instructional Technology, Bloomington, Indiana.

..., Applied Communication: A Pilot Test on the Prototype Module (1987). Agency for Instructional Technology, Bloomington, Indiana.

..., Applied Communication: Final Design Report (March, 1987). Agency for Instructional Technology, Bloomington, Indiana.